



## II

Effective October 21, 1980, in OAH Case No. L-21699, respondent's license was revoked and her probation terminated for violating then-existing BPC Sections 2399.5, 2141, and 2373, and for violating certain terms of her probation. The bases of the disciplinary action were: (1) that respondent practiced medicine during the period in which her license was under suspension; (2) that, while practicing medicine during the period of suspension, respondent repeatedly prescribed controlled substances without conducting a good faith prior examination; (3) that respondent failed to submit a community service program to the Division for approval; (4) that respondent failed to submit quarterly reports to the Division; and (5) that respondent failed to obey all laws of the State of California.

## III

On or about January 20, 1982, respondent filed a petition for reinstatement of her license; said petition is presently pending. Attached to her petition were the verified recommendations of Ernest Smith, M.D. and Earl L. Woods, M.D. Dr. Woods has no personal knowledge of respondent's activities since October 21, 1980. A letter filed by Michael Weinraub, M.D., in support of respondent's petition, is not verified and cannot, therefore, be treated as a recommendation within the meaning of BPC Section 2307.

## IV

The circumstances surrounding the disciplinary action set forth in Finding I above are that during the years 1974 through 1976, respondent repeatedly billed Medi-Cal for services she did not render, including billing Medi-Cal for hourly consultations with patients whom she spoke with over the telephone for brief periods and for patients whom she consulted with for less than one hour. Respondent, while purportedly acknowledging her wrongdoing in this matter, suggests that the wrongdoing was due to her naivety in business matters rather than deliberate actions on her part; respondent fails to acknowledge the full extent of her wrongdoing and continues to demonstrate a lack of awareness regarding her obligations under the Medi-Cal program.

## V

The circumstances surrounding the disciplinary action set forth in Finding II above are that respondent, while her license was under suspension, practiced medicine at a clinic specializing in drug abuse patients. While at that clinic respondent repeatedly wrote prescriptions for controlled substances without conducting a good faith prior examination of each patient. Respondent fails to acknowledge any wrongdoing on her part in this matter; she insists that she thought the Division knew that she was working at the clinic, that she took family histories of patients for whom she prescribed

medication, and that psychiatrists regularly prescribe medication for patients without conducting physical examinations.

## VI

Approximately one and a half years have passed since respondent's license was revoked. During this time she has made little rehabilitation efforts. Her major effort, to date, has been that since the fall of 1981 she has been assisting Dr. Michael Weinraub, a pediatrician practicing in Inglewood, two mornings per week by taking family histories of his patients and providing "support" assistance to the parents of his patients. Respondent does this work on a volunteer basis, and is not paid by Dr. Weinraub.

## VII

Since revocation of her license respondent has been attending approximately twenty-five hours of Category I continuing education programs per year. Respondent's present knowledge of controlled substances is not current, and substantial continuing educational courses should be taken in this area. Moreover, in light of the nature of the disciplinary action against respondent and her continuing absence from the actual of medicine, the number of continuing education courses taken by respondent is insufficient and demonstrates lack of serious rehabilitation efforts on her part.

## VIII

Respondent's testimony during the reinstatement hearing was rambling and, at times, incoherent. Respondent receives no professional psychiatric or counseling assistance on a regular basis. It is suggested that, as part of her rehabilitation efforts, she engage a licensed psychologist or physician to provide psychiatric care and counseling to her on a regular basis. Additionally, respondent suffers from hypothyroidism, which could affect her physical and mental condition. It is also suggested that respondent obtain regular medical treatment for her thyroid condition.

## IX

At this time respondent's professional ability appears to be substantially diminished. She occasionally attends lectures given by professional associations in diverse and eclectic subject areas. Substantial efforts should be made by respondent to update her professional ability in her area of practice, psychiatry.

\* \* \* \* \*

Pursuant to the foregoing findings of fact, the Panel makes the following determination of issues:

I

Grounds exist to deny respondent's petition for reinstatement pursuant to BPC Section 2307 in that respondent failed to have attached to her petition two verified recommendations from physicians and surgeons with personal knowledge of her activities since October 21, 1980, as set forth in Finding III above.

II

Additional grounds exist to deny respondent's petition for reinstatement of her license in that respondent has failed to establish her rehabilitation, and the public welfare would be adversely affected by such reinstatement, as set forth in Findings IV - IX above, separately and as to all of them.

\* \* \* \* \*

WHEREFORE, THE FOLLOWING ORDER is hereby made:

The petition of Sara Kebe Carter, M.D., for reinstatement of her license is denied.

This Decision shall become effective July 19, 1982.

IT IS SO ORDERED this 27 day of May, 1982.

ELEVENTH DISTRICT MEDICAL QUALITY  
REVIEW COMMITTEE  
BOARD OF MEDICAL QUALITY ASSURANCE



THOMAS M. HERIC, M.D.  
Chairperson

RMC:mh